

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge the allowance of claims 4, 5, and 7.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbano (U.S. Pat. No.: 4,481,887). Specifically, the Examiner stated:

In regard to claims 1, 3, 6: Urbano discloses the claimed invention Fig. 1, column 3, lines 60 – 64, security doors 1 having first pair of panels (doors) 3 for separating an unsecured area from a vestibule (walkway) 5, column 4, lines 33 – 37, the motor control unit 18 outer door motor open doors 3 and allow a person to enter the vestibule 5 after which the doors close automatically, Fig. 6, column 5, lines 30 – 40, the relay 24 used as an identifier for approving a person, having a second pair of panels (inner doors) 3 separating the vestibule 5 from a secured area from an open position to closed position after the person has passed therethrough. Urbano discloses all of the structural limitations; therefore it would have been obvious steps method for moving the traffic within the panels.

In regard to claims 8 – 9, Urbano discloses the claimed invention column 5, lines 41 – 50, having switch 23 for opening the second pair of panels (inner doors) 3 which separate secured area from vestibule 5 from open position to closed position when identify the person is not approved and trap unauthorized person inside the vestibule 5. Urbano does not disclose the method of closing second pair of panels or doors from open to closed position if person is identified as not approved. Urbano discloses all of the structural limitations; therefore it would have been obvious steps method of closing the inner doors or panels in case unauthorized person enters the secured area and trapping the unauthorized person inside the vestibule.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office has misconstrued the teachings of Urbano. It is believed that Urbano, in fact, teaches away from the claimed invention. Urbano teaches a security system having outer and inner doors that are normally in the closed position. Operation of the security system begins when a user approaches the outer doors. Photocell 13, 13' senses the user's approach and activates a motor control unit 18 which opens the outer doors, thus allowing the user to enter a vestibule (column 4, lines 31 – 36). The outer doors are automatically closed after the user enters the vestibule (column 4, lines 36 – 37). Closure of the outer doors triggers a time delay relay 26 within a control circuit (column 4, lines 37 – 39). The time delay relay 26 establishes a predetermined time delay. After the predetermined time delay has elapsed, a second motor control unit 21 is activated and the inner doors are opened allowing the user to exit the vestibule (column 4, lines 39 – 43).

According to Urbano, a user must wait for the outer doors to open before entering the vestibule (the outer doors are only opened after the photocell sensor is triggered by the user). After the user enters the vestibule, the user must wait for the outer doors to close to activate the time delay relay. The user

must further wait for the predetermined time period to elapse before the inner doors are activated. Finally, the user must wait for the inner doors to travel to their open position before the user can exit the vestibule.

In contrast, the method of the claimed invention relates to a system that has inner and outer panels/doors that are normally in the open position. The claimed invention does not require photocells to sense the approach of a person and open the first set of panels/doors. Accordingly, a person is able to walk directly onto the walkway separating the unsecured area from the secured area without having to stop and wait for the first set of panels/doors to open. The first pair of panels/doors are moved to a blocked position only after the person passes onto the walkway. More specifically, claims 1 and 6 recite “moving a first pair of panels (doors) separating an unsecured area from a walkway from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough.”

While on the walkway, the person is identified as being either approved or not approved. More specifically, claims 1 and 6 recite “identifying said person as approved.” The claimed invention does not require a circuit having a time delay relay to open the second set of panels/doors. If the person is identified as approved, the person can continue directly into the secured area without ever having to stop on the walkway. Claims 1 and 6 recite “moving a second pair of panels (doors) separating said walkway from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after said person has passed therethrough.” The second pair of panels/doors are moved to a blocked position only after the person exits the walkway and passes into the secured area; the movement of the second pair of panels/doors is independent of the closing of the first set of panels/doors.

The claimed invention eliminates several waiting periods, reduces bottlenecks, and increases the amount of traffic flow. More specifically, a user does not have to wait for the first set of panels/doors to open (e.g., after triggering a photocell), does not have to wait for the first set of panels/doors to close to activate a time delay relay, does not have to wait for a predetermined time period to elapse, and/or does not have to wait for the second set of panels/doors to open before exiting the walkway.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. More specifically, the office has failed to provide adequate support as to how the disclosure of mere structural limitations in Urbano renders obvious the steps of the claimed method. The Office has also failed to address that Urbano teaches the need for several structural components that are not required by the claimed invention. For example, Urbano requires photocells 13, 13' to energize motor control unit 18 for opening the outer doors (column 4, lines 32 – 37). Also, Urbano requires a circuit having time delay relay 26 for producing the predetermined delay of approximately 2 to 7 seconds. It is

Appl. No.: 10/671,280
Docket No.: DB001018-002
Amdt. Dated: 18 April 2005
Reply to Office action of 18 October 2004

believed that Urbana, by teaching the need for these additional structural limitations for the functioning of their method, teaches away from the claimed invention. Accordingly, the claimed invention (which does not require a photocell and/or time delay relay to function) would not be obvious to one skilled in the art.

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, it is believed that claims 1 and 6 are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 6 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 8 depend from allowable base claim 1; and claim 9 depends from allowable claim 6. Thus for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claims 1 and 6, it is believed that claims 3 and 8 and claim 9, respectively, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3, 8, and 9 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbano (U.S. Pat. No.: 4,481,887) in view of Fufido et al. (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,720,874). Specifically, the Examiner stated:

Urbano discloses the claimed invention except identifying the person while the person is in the unsecured area. Fufido teaches Fig. 1, column 5, line 48-56, having a camera 22 for identifying the person in unsecured area before entering into secured area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to provide a camera in outside the security door in order to prevent unauthorized entry from a public area into a secure area as taught by Fufido.

Claim 2 depends from allowable claim 1. As discussed above, Urbano fails to teach or suggest the invention recited in claim 1 (e.g., Urbano fails to teach or suggest “moving a first pair of panels separating an unsecured area from a walkway from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough” and “moving a second pair of panels separating said walkway from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after said person has passed therethrough”) and the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. It is believed that Office has failed to demonstrate that Fufido provides these missing teachings.

Thus, for these reasons, it is believed that claim 2 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 2 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Appl. No.: 10/671,280
Docket No.: DB001018-002
Amdt. Dated: 18 April 2005
Reply to Office action of 18 October 2004

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 – 9 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than through allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Coldren
Reg. No. 44,084
Thorp Reed & Armstrong LLP
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425
(412) 394-2442

Dated: 18 April 2005

Attorneys for Applicant